

IV. REMARKS

Status of the Claims

Claims 1, 15, 29, 43, and 47 are amended. New claim 63 is added. claims 11, 25, 39, 44, 59, and 60 are cancelled. Claims 1-10, 12-24, 26-38, 40-43, 45-58, and 61-63 are presented for further consideration.

Applicant has considered the Examiner's comments set forth in the Office Action mailed March 20, 2007 and responds in detail below. Reconsideration of the application is respectfully requested in view of the amendments and the following remarks.

The Office Action

Applicant has amended claim 1, 15, 29, 43, and 47 and cancelled claim 59 to overcome the objections raised by the Examiner in the Office Action. Claims 11, 25, 39, and 60 are cancelled to overcome the rejection based on 35USC112. Claims 43, and 45-58, 61 and 62 are amended to overcome the rejection based on 35USC101. It is submitted that the claims, as amended, fully remedy the basis for the objections and rejection. No new matter is presented. The amendments to the claims are not intended to be limiting, are not made for reasons related to patentability, and should not be interpreted to raise issues of estoppel.

Claims 1,3,9,11,12,14,15,17,23,25,26,28,29,31,37,39,40,42-44,46,48,54,56,58, and 60-62, stand rejected under 35USC103(a) based on the combined teaching of the cited reference Meppelink et al, U.S. Patent No. 5,542,063 and Sullivan U.S. Patent No. 5,737,557. The Examiner is respectfully requested to reconsider the rejection in view of the above amendments and the following remarks. This rejection is traversed on the following grounds:

The combined teaching of Meppelink and Sullivan does not render listed claims obvious because it fails to teach or otherwise suggest each and every limitation of the claims. It is well settled that in order to establish a prima facie case for obviousness, the prior art reference (or references when combined) must teach or suggest all the claim limitations. The teaching or suggestion to make the claimed combination and the reasonable expectation of success must both be found in the prior art, without reference to the disclosure of this application. (MPEP Section 2142) ***In re Vaeck*, 947 F.2d 488, 20 USPQ2d 1438 (Fed. Cir. 1991). See MPEP § 2143 - § 2143.03 for decisions pertinent to each of these criteria."**

Claim 1 includes the following language:

**"determining a view route comprising said at least one view;
passing said view route to a view router from said first application;"
launching at least one view based on said view route; and
continuing said first application when at least part of said view route has been processed.**

All of the independent claims of this application have equivalent limitations.

The combined teaching of Meppelink and Sullivan fail to disclose or suggest these features.

Meppelink discloses an input device emulator that comprises an interpreter for a windowed environment. The interpreter reads and executes commands from a file. The interpreter commands correspond to a variety of user interface control device actions and relate to the manipulation of the windowed environment and the entry of text via a keyboard. The interpreter simulates an actual user for mass-testing purposes.

Meppelink also discloses that the windowed environment comprises an application program that communicates with a window server program. The window server program provides the user interface display instruction required to form graphical windows and the information contained therein. The user interface display instructions are provided via the input device emulator to a stream module and, from there, to a device driver and a hardware interface.

The user interface instructions, received from the user, are processed in the opposite direction. They are recorded by a hardware interface and provided via a device driver and a stream module to the input device emulator and from there to the window server. The window server reads the user interface instructions that indicate a keyboard key, a mouse movement or a mouse button press or release.

The window server then indicates to the application program the action that is associated with the target of the user interface action. As an expert skilled in the art appreciates, the target may cause the execution of an object method, which provides, for example, new data to the window. The benefit of placing a user interface emulator between the stream modules and the window server is that the fact whether a user interface action indication originates from an actual user or from an emulator script may be hidden from the window server. Thus, software testing may be made easier.

Meppelink fails to disclose or suggest determining a view route comprising at least one view. In Meppelink, an order for the opening of windows in a test script interpreted by the emulator is a mere by-product or a small subset of the overall user interface manipulation instructions. Such manipulations comprise a plurality of other actions in between the changing of windows such as data entry, window resizing, menu item selections, scrollbar rolling, button pressings and other function present in a windowed user interface.

Therefore, Meppelink fails to disclose or suggest how to reduce the test scripts to yield a mere view route. Further, Meppelink discloses a testing method and thus teaches against a solution where test script functionality is used in a normal operating mode. An expert skilled in the art would not necessarily understand to apply the test scripts of Meppelink to control a set of already-tested fully functional applications. Further, Meppelink fails to disclose how individual views may be launched from an application that may offer more than one view.

Sullivan fails to disclose the features of launching at least one view based on said view route and continuing said first application when at least part of said view route has been processed.

Sullivan discloses a windowed environment where a number of collective actions may be associated with the files contained in a software suite. A software suite is a file and program folder displayed to the user as an icon that may be expanded to a window by user selection (Sullivan, column 5, lines 58 — 60). It comprises files from different file system directories. Each software suite has associated with it a storage element in which is stored contextual information for defining the appearance and behaviour of the software suite window. A spot interface is designed to float on top of the desktop and all open windows.

The placement of the mouse pointer symbol over the spot interface results in a display of a circular visual element that encircles the spot interface. The circular visual element, in other words, a collar comprises four quadrants each of which correspond to a secondary user interface. A secondary user interface comprises a number of access buttons that are used to launch a corresponding software suite.

The disclosure of Sullivan is limited to a system in which a program group or program may be launched with a mouse. Sullivan fails to disclose or suggest the feature of launching at least one view based on the view route. In Sullivan there is nothing that corresponds to a view route. Sullivan does not disclose anything corresponding to a

command script in the sense taught by Meppelink. Therefore, a person skilled in the art would not know how to apply Sullivan in Meppelink.

Further, Sullivan fails to disclose the feature of continuing said first application when at least part of said view route has been processed. Sullivan fails to disclose what the first application to be continued is and how the continuing of an application is associated with the processing of at least part of a view route. Further, Sullivan fails to disclose or suggest a motivation for combining the features of launching at least one view based on the view route and continuing said first application when at least part of said view route has been processed.

Due to all of the foregoing reasons, applicants respectfully submit that the amended claims 1, 15, 29 and 43 are patentable over Meppelink in view of Sullivan.

Dependent claims 2—10, 12—14, 16—24, 26—28, 30—38, 40—42, 45— 58, 61 and 62 depend on one of the independent claims, either directly or via intervening claims, and are therefore also patentable over Meppelink in view of Sullivan.

Claims 2, 4-8, 10,13,16, 18-22, 24, 27, 30, 32-36, 38, 41,45, 47, 49-50, 51-53, 55, 57 and 59 stand rejected based on the combined teaching of Meppelink and Sullivan and further in view of Bahrs, U.S. Patent No. 7,181,686. This rejection is traversed on the following grounds:

The combined teaching of Meppelink and Sullivan does not render listed claims obvious because it fails to teach or otherwise suggest each and every limitation of the claims. It is well settled that in order to establish a prima facie case for obviousness, the prior art reference (or references when combined) must teach or suggest all the claim limitations. The teaching or suggestion to make the claimed combination and the reasonable expectation of success must both be found in the prior art, without reference to the disclosure of this application. (MPEP Section 2142) *In re Vaeck*,

947 F.2d 488, 20 USPQ2d 1438 (Fed. Cir. 1991). See MPEP § 2143 - § 2143.03 for decisions pertinent to each of these criteria."

Claim 1 includes the following language:

**"determining a view route comprising said at least one view;
passing said view route to a view router from said first application;"
launching at least one view based on said view route; and
continuing said first application when at least part of said view route has been processed.**

All of the independent claims of this application have equivalent limitations.

The combined teaching of Meppelink, Sullivan, and Bahrs fail to disclose or suggest these features for the reasons stated above, because the disclosure of Bahrs fails to remedy the deficiencies of the combined teaching of Meppelink and Sullivan.

The rejection is further traversed on the following grounds. The disclosure of Bahrs fails to disclose or suggest the following limitation of claim 2:

"gathering data from said at least one view; and passing said data from said view router to said first application or to a subsequent application in said view route."

This language is contained in all of the above claims listed by the Examiner either by dependency or otherwise.

Bahrs disclose a method and apparatus for presenting a set of screens in a graphical user interface for a data processing system. The system is for use in a distributed user environment comprising multiple clients and server processors. Out of the a 155 page document, the examiner has cited lines 20-30 of column 4 of Bahrs and based on this excerpt has characterized the disclosure as follows:

"Bahrs discloses a data collection method from user and processing such data."

The reference Bahrs is a data processing system and the Examiner cites Bahrs as a disclosure of such a system in its broadest sense. Applicant does not claim a generic data processing method, but merely a specific step, program code, method, and device as part of processing data input from multiple applications having different views. The language of claim 2 describes how data may be gathered from one view of one application and routed through a view router to other applications. Bahrs fails to disclose or suggest this feature.

These grounds apply equally to the rejected dependent claims, all of which, by dependency, have the limitations described in the independent claims. The cited reference Bahrs fails to remedy the deficiencies of the primary combined teaching of Meppelink and Sullivan.

For all of the above reasons, it is respectfully submitted that all of the claims now present in the application are clearly novel and patentable over the prior art of record, and are in proper form for allowance. Accordingly, favorable reconsideration and allowance is respectfully requested. Should any unresolved issues remain, the Examiner is invited to call Applicants' attorney at the telephone number indicated below.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge payment for any fees associated with this communication or credit any over payment to Deposit Account No. 16-1350.

Respectfully submitted,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Geza C. Ziegler, Jr.", written over a horizontal line.

Geza C. Ziegler, Jr.
Reg. No. 44,004

19 June 2007

Date

Perman & Green, LLP
425 Post Road
Fairfield, CT 06824
(203) 259-1800
Customer No.: 2512



CERTIFICATE OF MAILING

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Postal Service on the date indicated below as first class mail in an envelope addressed to Mail Stop Amendment, Commissioner of Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

Date: 19 June 2007 Signature: 
Person Making Deposit